



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re: Application of Roman Golicz et al.

Serial No. 08/962,077

Date: April 26, 2006

Filed: September 14, 1998

Examiner: David Bollinger.

Applicant: Roman Golicz et al.

Art Unit: 3651

Title: Sheet Feeding Apparatus

Atty. No. 9534

LETTER

Applicants send this letter with their RCE. In filing this RCE, applicants are withdrawing their appeal. Applicants filed a reply brief and the Board questioned the timeliness of the reply brief. Any appeal board timeliness issue is now moot. The reply brief is nonetheless part of the record, and thus applicants have not exercised the option of reproducing the arguments of the reply brief with this submittal, as if the reply brief had not been submitted. They request in the RCE form that the arguments in both the appeal brief and reply brief be considered.

For the examiner's convenience, enclosed is a status of claims.

Applicants do not think their argument rests upon a differing judgment from the examiner, about motivation/teaching to combine. Applicants truly believe they have good arguments about the inoperability of the combination of the prior art, and what is being claimed vs. what the prior art discloses/teaches.

For reasons set forth in the appeal brief and the reply brief, applicants request reconsideration and allowance.

A petition to make special on basis of one applicants' age was hand-delivered on March 1, 2000, and the application should have been made special.

Respectfully submitted,
ROMAN GOLICZ et al.

By C. G. Nessler
Their Attorney

Charles G. Nessler
Box H
Chester, CT 06412 (860) 526 9149 fax (860) 526 1043

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 26, 2006

C. G. Nessler
C. G. Nessler